

## Integrated Planning RFQ Questions and Responses

As of 1/29/2016

- Q: The deadline says Tuesday February 29. February 29 is a Monday. Which is it?
  - The deadline is February 29 – that is a MONDAY not a Tuesday. We will make that correction to the RFQ. Sorry.
- Q: Is the budget for the project expected to remain below the “budget” page in the grant in Appendix B?
  - No! The “budget” page in the grant is not a budget, but rather a schedule of performance payments related only to the grant. The grant will provide \$100,000 which will go towards what is anticipated to be a larger budget. The grant requires a match of at least \$100,000, so the minimum overall budget is \$200,000, but could be higher. Again, cost/fees/price will not be discussed until the proposals have been ranked and negotiations start with the top ranked consultant.
- Clarification on the RFQ’s indicated preference for local firms: While there are a handful of firms with a local presence who may be able to, through partnerships with other local firms, meet the breadth and depth of technical expertise and EXPERIENCE on similar projects, the City understands and expects that this RFQ may require local firms to partner with larger, national scale firms that do not often work in Vermont municipalities. We encourage potential proposers to review the scoring criteria to understand the various levels of importance of local presence vs. other criteria for selection. We do strongly prefer that any firms that do not have experience working in Vermont and specifically Burlington do partner with firms who can provide that context and potential cost savings from minimal travel for the anticipated field work. Moreover, since this is an innovative approach in Vermont, as a secondary benefit of this project we hope to improve local capacity for this type of planning in the Vermont consulting community.

As of 2/11/2016:

Q: Would Burlington consider extending the deadline since the last week of February is school vacation?

- Given that this is the only request for an extension that we have received, at this time we would like to maintain the currently proposed schedule since we don’t know how long final scope and fee negotiation will take, and we will also have to go through local approvals (Board of Finance and City Council) before submitting our loan application. Moreover, we want to provide the project with as much of the CY 16 field season as possible.

Q: The submission requirements include “Contact information for references from relevant projects.” Does this mean you want contact information/references for all of the project descriptions we include or just the “key” ones for each skill area?

- The City would prefer that contact information be provided for every product description provided by the proposer as evidence of their expertise in the various skill sets. A SOQ will not be considered un-responsive and ineligible for consideration if there are a “few” project descriptions here or there that do not have contact information as long as the proposer has provided project descriptions for that same area of expertise that do have contact information. However, proposer should be prepared to provide that contact information if requested by the City.

Q: Does the City wish to see resumes for every member of the project team?

- Concise and relevant resumes should be included as part of the SOQ. However, we envision that the information requested in the SOQ requirements for the list of team members will be summarized in some way in the body of the SOQ for efficiency of review – with the resumes available for cross-reference.

Q: Is there a copy of the WWTP Optimization Report referenced in the RFQ available?

- There is no report for the WWTP Optimization efforts. If you have specific questions regarding those efforts, please submit them and we can try to provide a response. However, our preference would be to wait until we are in the scope development phase for documentation of our findings to date.

Q: In the case where our proposal includes members and projects from your existing WRTAP (Water Resources Technical Assistance Program) SOQs – would you prefer that we reference the projects and resumes in the WRTAP SOQ to save paper, or include everything in this SOQ?

- We’d love to save paper, but in this instance we would like proposers to submit a complete package that does not rely on our referencing other previous proposals.